United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.25

General Assembly

Official Records

Fiftieth session

First Committee

25th Meeting

Friday, 17 November 1995, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters.

Cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. As far as A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 is concerned, we are having consultations with the sponsors and other interested delegations as to when we are going to take up this draft resolution.

Cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.45.

Cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1. As far as A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 are concerned, we will probably have to take them up this afternoon because we are still waiting for the statement on financial implications. So the Chair is planning to take up those two resolutions — A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 — this afternoon when we receive the programme budget implications.

Cluster 11: we will have to defer action on A/C.1/50/L.25 until Monday, upon the request of the sponsors of the draft resolution. As far as A/C.1/50/L.7 is concerned, if consultations are conclusive by this afternoon, we may take it up then. I will keep the Committee informed about the developments of this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): We are of course willing to pursue all possible means of informal consultations on A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, but we would also like to stress the fact that by the afternoon we will be in a position to take up this draft resolution, and we hope that all necessary consultations will be conducted from now until early afternoon. We maintain the view that this draft resolution should be taken up this afternoon.

The Chairman: The Chair is doing its utmost to marry conflicting views on this particular issue and will certainly try to arrive at a mutually accommodating solution to this issue.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Sri Lanka to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka has asked to speak to introduce resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, on the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The draft resolution has been reissued for technical reasons.

95-86720 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The year 1995 has been a momentous one, particularly for the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. After going through a preparatory process, both in New York and Geneva, 175 States parties to the Treaty met in New York in April this year for the purpose of reviewing and taking a decision on the question of extending the most widely adhered to treaty by the international community. The outcome of the Conference is widely known and therefore I do not have to go into that matter now.

In its capacity as the country which had the honour and the privilege of providing the President of the Conference, Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, Sri Lanka thought it appropriate that at its fiftieth session the General Assembly should take note of this historic event jointly arrived at by the States parties to the Treaty. The intention of my delegation was to present a procedural draft resolution which would have allowed the General Assembly to take note of the principal decisions taken by the Conference. However, after consultations involving all interested parties, Sri Lanka was able to reformulate the draft resolution as seen in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. Before proceeding any further, I should like to thank all delegations which took part in the consultations and extended their cooperation, without which it would not have been possible for me to present the draft resolution to the First Committee.

May I draw the attention of the members to the draft resolution. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the resolution takes note of the fact that on 11 May 1995 parties to the Treaty adopted three decisions and a resolution, namely, decisions on strengthening the review process for the disarmament; on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament; and on extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; and the resolution on the Middle East. In adopting these two operative paragraphs, the General Assembly will be taking note of the principal decisions taken by the Review and Extension Conference.

Operative paragraph 3 is important in that in it the Assembly would note other main decisions taken by the States parties to the Conference.

Subparagraph (a) refers to the agreement to strengthen the review process for the operation of the Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realized. The subparagraph also details the action that should be taken to fulfil the review process. The content of subparagraph (a) was taken from paragraphs 1 and 2 of decision 1 referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Subparagraph (b) is an affirmation of the need to continue to move with determination towards the full realization and effective implementation of the provisions of the Treaty for which the States parties to the Treaty adopted a set of principles and objectives. The language of this subparagraph is drawn from decision 2 referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Reference is made in subparagraph (c) to the manner in which the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely was taken. For this purpose, the language appearing in the final paragraph of decision 3, referred to in paragraph 1, was utilized.

In this manner the draft resolution has attempted to find a careful balance of what was stated in the three decisions referred to in paragraph 1.

Sri Lanka is aware of the fact that the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was an event involving States parties to the Treaty.

My delegation is well aware of the fact that among us there are States that are non-party to the Treaty. Notwithstanding this fact, it is my delegation's hope that the States non-parties to the Treaty will be gracious enough to permit the draft resolution to be adopted without a vote. However, if there is a request for a vote, my delegation earnestly requests the States parties to the Treaty, who represent the overwhelming majority of the international community, to vote *en bloc* in favour of the draft resolution.

Finally, it should be stated for the record that many delegations expressed their desire to join in sponsoring the draft resolution. In spite of their commitment to non-proliferation, those delegations graciously stood aside to permit my delegation to hold consultations and finalize the draft resolution. While we appreciate their cooperation I wish to express my sincere thanks particularly to the delegations of Bangladesh and South Africa for the support given to my delegation by their sponsorship of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Ms. Ghose (India): My delegation wishes to make a few general and specific comments on the issues and draft resolutions which we are about to consider in cluster 1.

I should like first of all to make a specific comment on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8. This draft resolution is, in our view, an extremely important one and my delegation has in the past joined in sponsoring resolutions on the subject of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In view of our intense and sincere involvement in the negotiations on that treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, we would have wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution this year as well.

However, as we stated in the General Assembly and in the Committee, there has been a change in the international context this year. The indefinite extension of the NPT, followed by nuclear testing by some nuclear-weapon States and announcements of proposed non-explosive tests and reiteration of the maintenance of doctrines of deterrence by others, must lead all who are negotiating in Geneva to reassess and re-examine the situation with which they are faced. It cannot be "business as usual".

We feel that without disrupting ongoing negotiations, it is absolutely essential to locate the comprehensive test-ban treaty in the context of an overall programme for nuclear disarmament which, given the indefinite extension of the NPT, would have to be in a reasonable or specific time-frame.

Therefore, my delegation had proposed to the original sponsors a simple preambular paragraph which would have located the comprehensive test-ban treaty as a significant disarmament step in a phased programme leading eventually to the total elimination of nuclear weapons in a specific or even reasonable time-frame. Unfortunately, the sponsors were unable to accept the concept, let alone the text. Not wishing to hold up consensus on the draft resolution we regretfully withdrew our proposal but were unable to join the other sponsors as a sponsor. We will, of course, be pursuing the substantive issue in the negotiations in Geneva.

We recognize the need for intensive negotiations on the treaty in the coming months with the objective of obtaining a good and meaningful legally binding agreement that would enable all countries to voluntarily enter into the obligations being negotiated.

We place more emphasis on the quality and content of the final product than on the date on which the Treaty is completed. However desirable it may be to achieve a conclusion to the negotiations at the earliest feasible date, we will concentrate our efforts on ensuring that what is finally achieved truly serves the interests of peace and national and international security.

There are other draft resolutions which are being considered under this cluster today and I would like to make the following comments on the issues raised as a whole.

All of the draft resolutions, in one way or another, seek to bring into General Assembly resolutions concepts and language from a non-United Nations intergovernmental conference to which it happens we were not a party. We have already indicated our stand on this issue in previous draft resolutions. Let me state once again very clearly and as honestly as I can. India is not, and does not intend to become, party to the NPT, which we consider unequal and discriminatory. Now that it has been extended indefinitely, less so if that is possible.

We do not, and cannot, accept the logic that a few nations have the right to pursue their security by threatening the survival of mankind, nor is it acceptable that those who possess nuclear weapons are freed of all controls while those without are policed against their production. History is full of such prejudices paraded as iron laws: that men are superior to women; that white races are superior to the coloured; that colonialism is a civilizing mission, and that those who possess nuclear weapons are responsible Powers and those who do not, are not. The latter is a quotation from a speech made almost ten years ago by a former Prime Minister of my country and we believe that this is true even today. We recognize the sovereign right of every country to take such measures as it deems fit in the interests of its own security in the overall context of international peace and security. We expect that it will be recognized that we too have that right.

Therefore, by urging States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to sign the Treaty by welcoming the indefinite extension or reaffirming decisions to which we were not a party is, to say the least, neither logical nor serious.

We will therefore indicate our view on the three draft resolutions in this cluster appropriately and will be explaining our vote after the decisions are taken.

Mr. Bishop (Canada): Canada wishes briefly to make several key points on nuclear issues following upon its opening statement made to the Committee on 20 October 1995.

Those points are the following. Canada continues to attach great importance to the full implementation of the results of the May 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In that respect, the undertakings with regard to nuclear disarmament as set out in that Treaty and in the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament must be fulfilled with determination, and an effective comprehensive test-ban treaty must, in our view, be completed as soon as possible in 1996.

With regard to the last point, Canada regrets that we were unable to agree on a realistic deadline of 30 June 1996 for completion of the final text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. That deadline continues to be one towards which Canada will work.

In this overall context, Canada is, as we stated earlier, encouraged by the commitment of the United States, the United Kingdom and France to a true zero-yield comprehensive test-ban treaty. This bottom line on scope must be fully observed.

We also once again welcome the progress being made on nuclear-weapon-free zones, including the statement by France that France, the United States and the United Kingdom intend to adhere to the Treaty of Rarotonga. We intend to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23 on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Finally, we hope for, and strongly urge, further progress in the field of nuclear reduction, including reductions in the START context, by all nuclear-weapon States.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to speak?

If not, we have just received a request from the delegation of Egypt to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1. Accordingly, I now call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

This revised text takes into account the views expressed by many interested delegations in the First Committee. It was revised following broad and extensive consultations with many delegations. I hope it will be realized that it is a clear demonstration of the flexibility and good faith of the sponsors in addressing this important issue.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 is one of the many efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. It does so by advocating universality of the NPT at the regional level in the Middle East — an objective that is shared and fully supported by the international community as a whole. Suffice it to refer to the resolution on the Middle East which was sponsored by three nuclear-weapon States and adopted by the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) last May, and which is referred to in the preamble of the draft resolution.

In the final analysis, the draft resolution should be regarded as an invitation to all States in the Middle East to join a club — the NPT club. We believe that all parties to the NPT have a collective responsibility to support all efforts aimed at strengthening the non-proliferation regime.

The goal of universal adherence to the NPT in the Middle East is within our reach. Accession by the United Arab Emirates in September 1995 has brought one State closer to the realization of this objective. The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to register here, today, their sincere hope that this lofty goal will be attained in the very near future thereby marking the dawn of a new era in the Middle East.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that the draft resolution will not be presented at future sessions — that by the next session all States in the Middle East will be parties to the NPT.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of the United States to make a statement.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): I wish to make a brief statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

My Government is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution. It is an extremely important draft resolution —

dealing with one of the most important items we are considering in this Committee. It is a draft resolution that addresses a development, not one that is distant and desirable, but one that is momentous, historical and close at hand and it enjoys very broad support. Obviously, it had to result in compromises of different points of view, particularly over the timetable for the achievement of success in the Treaty.

President Clinton has proposed that we set for ourselves a timetable for the completion of the negotiations by April 1996 in order to have the treaty conformed, translated and, indeed, set in concrete by 30 June so that there could be a resumed session of the General Assembly for the purpose of considering a draft resolution and propagating the text so that the treaty itself could be opened for signature at the very beginning of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly — that is, in September 1996.

That is the American proposed timetable. Obviously, not all delegations shared that view and we have had to make compromises in the development of the text of the draft resolution but I would like to state once again, and for the record, my Government's approach: it relates particularly to the wording of paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft resolution, which we will of course support.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak on cluster 1, the Committee will proceed now to hear the statements of delegations in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

As draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 will have to be discussed at a later stage, I should like to ask those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting to do so at an appropriate time.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): My understanding is that we are making explanatory statements before the voting.

I wish to make some comments to explain the Chinese delegation's position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Chinese delegation has consistently held the view that it is a very important treaty. The Chinese delegation has hoped all along that this draft resolution would be adopted by consensus; it had also hoped that China would become one of the sponsors. However, the developments this year are such that the Chinese delegation cannot agree with certain substantive paragraphs in this draft resolution. The Chinese delegation cannot agree to certain elements contained in this year's draft resolution. They relate mainly to the time-frame for the opening of this treaty for signature.

In view of this, the Chinese delegation requests that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution and it will abstain on this paragraph. The last sentence of operative paragraph 2 suggests that the comprehensive test ban treaty should be open for signature by the outset of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly. In this regard, I should like to state that the Chinese delegation, like all of the sponsors, also hopes that the comprehensive test-ban treaty will be ready for signature as early as possible.

If it is possible for the treaty to be open for signature at the beginning of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly, that is very good. If it can be ready for signature earlier, that is even better. The Chinese delegation does not completely exclude such a possibility. However, if one should categorically state that this treaty should be opened for signature at the outset of the fifty-first session — if it is not based on any other political motivation — at best it only constitutes a benign good wish. It is really rather baseless. It is really not well-founded. If the Chinese delegation should make a commitment to this, it would be less than earnest, serious or responsible, for the Chinese delegation is not a fortune-teller.

Operative paragraph 4 states that the final text should be completed as soon as possible in 1996. Although this is not the consensual language of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, the Chinese delegation can still accept it. However, if the wording in this paragraph is to be compared with the wording in paragraph 2, it is not difficult to see that these two paragraphs are in conflict with each other. It is completely illogical for these two paragraphs to be included in the same draft resolution. In case the work on the final text of this treaty is not completed, people will ask, "What are you going to present to the States for signature?".

The time-frame specified in operative paragraph 2 will become a blank check — and of course, the Chinese delegation does not wish to see this happen. But what if such a situation arises? In order to avoid such confusion, the Chinese delegation proposed positive amendments to operative paragraph 2. However, they were not accepted by the co-sponsors. On this, the Chinese delegation cannot but feel regret.

The Chinese delegation holds that the comprehensive test-ban treaty is a very important nuclear arms control and disarmament treaty, the negotiation of which is also very important. This treaty will remain in effect indefinitely. In view of this, it is first and foremost of the utmost importance to guarantee the quality of the treaty. Only in such circumstances would the early conclusion and signature of such a treaty be meaningful.

It is known to all that this future treaty will establish its own, independent international verification system and effective on-site verification system. Such a regime will entail a series of political, legal, technical and financial problems. These problems are of a certain degree of complexity and difficulty. Besides, certain problems have still to be settled. The resolution of these problems requires not only political will on the part of the parties, but also a certain amount of time. The Chinese delegation holds that to disregard the realistic requirements of the process of negotiation of this treaty, to speculate and make judgements on the time-frame for the opening of this treaty for signature, and to set a specific date for its signature: all these things do not indicate a realistic and responsible attitude and would not help to promote the process of negotiation.

For the reasons I have stated, the Chinese delegation will abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

We are pleased to learn that progress has already been achieved in the negotiations. China will continue to participate in the negotiations in a positive and constructive manner, and to strive to achieve the conclusion of a satisfactory comprehensive test-ban treaty no later than 1996, or as early as possible.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan would like to explain its vote on the three draft resolutions that we will be taking up this morning in the cluster on nuclear items.

First of all, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, Pakistan is very appreciative of the fact that progress has been made in the negotiations for the conclusion of the treaty. We hope that we will be able to conclude a treaty that will contribute to both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The treaty is now within the grasp of the international community. Of course, a number of issues remain outstanding, including that of its scope. Pakistan is ready for intensive negotiations, on a priority basis, in the Conference on Disarmament in 1996, and we hope that we will be able to conclude the treaty as soon as possible next year. However, our support for this draft resolution and for its various provisions should not be construed as our subscription to artificial deadlines for the conclusion or signature of the treaty.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, introduced by the delegation of Japan and entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", I should like to make the following remarks.

First of all, my delegation does not question either the honesty or the intentions of the sponsors of this draft resolution. Unfortunately, the provisions of the draft resolution do not match its title. The draft resolution focuses very largely on nuclear non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament. Specifically, we are not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and therefore we cannot subscribe to the provisions of the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs or to the text of operative paragraph 1. Pakistan will therefore abstain in the voting on these paragraphs if they are voted on separately, and will also abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 as a whole.

Finally, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, which was introduced earlier today by the representative of Sri Lanka, I should like to say at the outset that we appreciate the fact that the delegation of Sri Lanka closely consulted with my delegation, although we are not a party to the NPT. We see this draft resolution as merely noting the decisions taken by the NPT Review and Extension Conference. We are not a party to these decisions; therefore our decision to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1 in no way constitutes an expression of our position on the substance of the decisions taken, and the documents adopted, at the Review and Extension Conference.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

We will begin by taking a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 2.

The draft resolution, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

We will begin by taking a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1 was retained by 161 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution as a whole without a vote? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Liechtenstein to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): I had asked for the floor before the draft resolution was adopted. I just wanted to state that my delegation is a co-sponsor of this draft resolution. This has been read out on previous occasions but not right before we took action on the draft resolution. That is the only point I wanted to make and I would like to ask that my statement be reflected in the record.

The Chairman: The Committee certainly will take note of the statement.

I call on the representative of the Gambia on a point of order.

Mr. Jallow (Gambia): I would like to make a similar request. The Gambia wished to be a co-sponsor of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: Your statement will be appropriately recorded in the proceedings.

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Similarly, my delegation wishes to state that the Islamic Republic of Iran is also a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1. We wish that to be reflected in the record.

The Chairman: Your statement will certainly be reflected in the proceedings.

I call on the representative of Malta on a point of order.

Ms. Darmanin (Malta): In a similar vein, we are also co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of Malta will be appropriately reflected in the proceedings of the First Committee.

I call on the representative of Benin on a point of order.

Mr. W[illegible]annou (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I would just like to say that we are also co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: Your statement will be appropriately reflected in the records.

If there are no other points of order, I should like to proceed now to call for a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. In this connection, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): On draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, I wish to inform representatives that, as brought to the attention of the Secretariat, a slight technical correction would need to be made in section *(c)* of the sixth preambular paragraph. The word "goal" should be changed to the plural: "goals". Accordingly, section *(c)* reads:

> "The determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons, and by all States of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,"

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This plural is not, as the Secretary of the Committee said, a technical change. As I understand it, what has been reproduced in this text is what was agreed at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I do not remember any plural in it. This is not just a technical change.

The Chairman: In this connection, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, and as you were privy to this situation, I did mention that it was brought to our attention. I am concerned now, of course, to refer to the fact that — and I am sure they will bear me out on this — the delegation of Japan has asked that this technical correction be made, that the letter "s" be added, that the word "goal" be changed to the plural. So we are following the instructions as discussed with the Secretariat and the Chairman, and as received from the delegation of Japan.

The Chairman: It was my understanding that a revision had been made, adding the letter "s" to the word "goal" in operative paragraph 2, where it calls for the "determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals", which is in the

plural, and it is my understanding that this plural was to be repeated in the same manner in the preambular paragraph above. So, from that particular point of view, it was my understanding that "goals", the second change to the word "goal", in the preambular paragraph was to be considered as a technical change rather than anything else. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I have certainly taken note of the statement of the representative of Mexico and the Chairman has explained as I explained earlier. But I should also point out that, to begin with, the word was "goals" in that particular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1. Accordingly, I believe that the Japanese delegation brought this to our attention when it submitted A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, which is now available.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Operative paragraph 2 was the subject of negotiations between the delegations of Mexico and Japan. It cannot be changed at the last minute. Without an opportunity at this stage to verify the precise language adopted at the Review and Extension Conference of the State Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mrs. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to clarify a point on this paragraph. It is indeed a direct quotation from the Final Document of the NPT Review and Extension Conference. I have with me a copy of the document containing the decision on strengthening the review process for the Treaty. The document is NPT/Conf.95/32 (Part I) of 11 May 1995. This is the decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament". In paragraph 4 *(c)*, the word "goals" appears as follows:

> "The determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons ...".

In fact, we confirmed this point with the Secretariat and were certainly given confirmation that this was indeed the wording of this document. As the Secretary of the Committee said, our original draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17 contains the word "goals".

The Chairman: I hope that this will answer the representative of Mexico's question.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I believe that there is a very simple solution here. It would appear that the difference is in the Spanish and English versions of the text adopted at the NPT Conference. The word adopted in Spanish was in the singular. I have been told, it has been confirmed, and I believe what the representative of Japan has said that it appears in the plural in English. In that case, I have no objection to the English version of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 keeping the plural, but in the Spanish version we must speak of "*el objetivo*" because it is in the singular.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I simply wished to state that the problem does indeed lie in the Spanish version and perhaps in some other versions in which the word appear in the singular. I think that we should stick with what was agreed or we shall end up adopting different texts.

The Chairman: The Spanish version of the draft resolution will be clarified in the context of the Final Document of the Review and Extension Conference. I hope that will satisfy all delegations.

Separate votes on the fifth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1 have been requested —

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I am sorry, but I do think we need to know what it is we are adopting. Are we talking about "goal" or "goals"? As I understand, this issue is still unresolved. I do not think, with the greatest respect for the Ambassador of Mexico, that it is a question of translation, because there is confusion, no doubt as a result of the Secretariat's attempts to reproduce documents in a hurry at the NPT Conference.

There is no doubt at all that, in document A/C.1/50/L.5, it is in the singular in English. It is my belief — and I do not know if anyone else who was concerned with the negotiations on the Principles and Objectives would disagree — that we negotiated "goal" and that is what it was.

But it seems that, between the time of the negotiation and the time of the production of the final documents which were adopted, the Secretariat, as often happens, tried to improve the English and added an "s" because it thought it read better in English. That is my only explanation. We have seen it often; we saw it in draft resolution

A/C.1/50/L.49 in this Committee. On two occasions the sponsor has tried to get the Secretariat to do what he asked them to do, and only in the end did he succeed.

So I think it is a mistake by the Secretariat. But I think we need to sort out whether we are talking about "goal" or "goals".

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): As to any errors, I would not want to go into details at this point, but we have written confirmation from the Japanese delegation concerning this matter, and that is why we pursued it as we did.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): I just wanted to state my agreement with the representative of the United Kingdom. I too was involved in the discussions that revolved around this document when it was originally being negotiated, and the word that was negotiated at that time was "goal", not the plural, "goals".

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I also took part in negotiations on this point, and can confirm what the representatives of the United Kingdom and of South Africa have just said. We certainly negotiated this word in the singular.

The Chairman: I propose to suspend the meeting briefly in order to sort this matter out.

The meeting was suspended at 12.45 p.m. and resumed at 1.10 p.m.

The Chairman: Owing to the lateness of the hour I shall now adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.